

Markovian simulation for ancestors trees

C. Jarne*

UNQ - Departamento de Ciencia y Tecnología. IFIBA (DF-UBA) Lab. de Sistemas Dinámicos (CONICET). Pabellón I Ciudad Universitaria CP:1428. Buenos Aires - Argentina

M. Caruso†

Departamento de Física Teórica y del Cosmos, Universidad de Granada, Campus de Fuentenueva, Spain

(Dated: December 28, 2016)

We present a computational model to reconstruct ancestor trees of animals with sexual reproduction following the theoretical model presented in *Phys. Rev. E* **90**, 022125 (2014). Through a recursive algorithm combined with a random number generator, it is possible to reproduce the number of ancestor for each generation and use it to constraint a maximum number of the following generation. This simulation allows to consider the reproductive preferences of particular species and combine several trees to simulate the population behavior. With this approach it is also possible to describe the simulation algorithm as a theoretical stochastic process.

I. INTRODUCTION

Previous works have shown that it is not possible to reconstruct the genealogical history of each species along all its generations through a geometric progression [1]. The reason is that the geometric progression is determined by a sequence of independent events. From the model point of view, we postulated that blood relationship between ancestors (or inbreeding) is the key to connect the consecutive generations.

It is well known that close inbreeding within species can result in inbreeding depression caused by an increased homozygosity of recessive, deleterious alleles and loss of heterosis [2]. However, extreme intraspecific outbreeding can also be disadvantageous (outbreeding depression) [3], because beneficial gene complexes or local genetic adaptations are disrupted [4]. There is numerous empirical support that animals avoid close kin as mating partner [5–7]. Optimal outbreeding theory [8] is supported by experimental behavioral studies showing mating preferences for intermediately related individuals [9] and by genetic studies reporting stabilizing selection on genomic divergence in wild populations of animals [10] and plants [11].

Empirical studies of inbreeding strategy have reported inbreeding tolerance in different species such as New Zealand robins, *Petroica australis* [12]; bighorn sheep (*Ovis canadensis*) [13]; great tits (*Parus major*) [14] and even inbreeding preference in cichlid fish (*Pelvicachromis taeniatus*) [15]. Recent studies have also found evidence of regular incest in wild mammals, even in social species where relatives are spatio-temporally clustered and opportunities for inbreeding frequently arise [16].

Considering some degree of incest along biparental species as a key to build a general model and using a Markov process it is possible to obtain a more realistic model for a tree of ancestors [17].

If we consider a random variable that represents the number of ancestors present in a given generation, the size of the sample space depends on each generation. This brings huge problems to find an analytical solution.

In [17] we proposed a method to solve this problem. Now we present here an alternative way to obtain an estimation of the mean value of the ancestors number for each generation following the same time-line approach that [17], meaning starting from the present and tracking back the possible sequence of ancestors, but now using a simple computational model to follow back the chain of ancestors.

Our first model implemented consisted in a simple algorithm that we will describe in the following sections. Before starting the description, there are two important assumptions about the biology of the considered system. Initially the species described here has no specific behavior of sexual partner selection (random mating reproduction) [18, 19]. This means that in our model the partner could be a kin or not. Many species or population groups exhibit this kind of reproduction. This is the most simple case to perform the calculation. The second assumption is about the population size. The distribution of ancestors for a given generation is contained in a population large enough to not force the selection of blood-related sexual partners. The partners could be blood related or not, randomly up to a maximum generation when the process start to decrease. Current model presents a random mating in non-overlapping generations with negligible mutation and selection. These two assumptions are common to develop population genetic models; in particular, these are present in the Hardy-Weinberg principle [20, 21].

* cecilia.jarne@unq.edu.ar

† mcaruso@ugr.es

We present a description of the problem through an algorithmic and analytic approach. The structure of this manuscript is developed as follows: Section II is a description of the algorithm implemented to generate the trees of ancestors. Section III shows an equivalent description and a generalization in terms of mathematical symbols. A comparative results between the implemented algorithm and the theoretical model [17] are presented in Section IV. Finally in Section V we present conclusions and further work.

II. BUILDING THE COMPUTATIONAL MODEL

II.1. A simplified tree of ancestors

We started creating a simplified tree of ancestors for one individual in the following way. In this work we considered an index n that labeled the generation number, starting from $n = 0$ the *parents* generation, $n = 1$ the *grandparents* generation and so forth. At the beginning of all we fix the number of ancestors for the first generation, $n = 0$, at 2, because the individuals have sexual reproduction. In successive generations $n \geq 1$ we run a random number generator, denoted by r_n , to obtain a number between 2 and a maximum value that will depend on generation number. In each generation the maximum possible ancestors number is:

$$R_n = 2^{n+1}. \quad (1)$$

To avoid a high endogamy degree at the beginning of the tree, we also fix this value at generation $n = 1$ at 4. Therefore in the next generation, $n = 2$, the maximum possible ancestor number is $R_2 = 8$. Now at $n = 2$ for the first time we run a random generator with a uniform distribution to obtain a number between 2 and R_2 . The possible maximum number for ancestors in the following generation, $n = 3$ is less than or equal to R_3 . Actually this value depends on the random value obtained in the generation before.

In general, for one individual at the generation n is not possible to have more ancestors that the double of the ancestors obtained in $n - 1$ (two parents per each predecessor), i.e:

$$r_n \leq 2r_{n-1}, \quad (2)$$

and of course we have $r_n \leq R_n$, for all n . The expression (2) is a *better* upper bound that $r_n \leq R_n$, because $2r_{n-1} \leq R_n$.

To illustrate a set of possible trees, the Figure 1 shows three simple examples for the first generations in the chain.

For each n -generation in the tree, we obtained a random number r_n between the limits given for the random number obtained in the previous generation, i.e.




FIG. 1. (Color online). Example of three kinds of genealogical trees (only the first few n generations) to illustrate the different possible inbreeding cases. (a) No restrictions by blood relationship. (b, c) Two kinds of restriction in third generation: ancestors sharing one parent (b) and ancestors sharing two parents (c). The restriction by blood relationship increases according to the degree of endogamy [17].

$r_n \in [2, 2r_{n-1}]$, which represents the possibility of blood relationship, or endogamy, between the individuals of the same generation. A full tree is developed via a generation number loop increasing program. In order to avoid any possible bias in the tree we change the seed of the random generator in each run. Additionally we establish a given generation in which the ancestors number is maximum (more detail presented in Section II.3).

The length of the genealogical tree is as long as we want to define, for instance in our illustrative example we use $N = 50$ generations at most, depending on when the random generator obtain a minimum of 2 ancestors. Nevertheless an important consideration is that the simulation of one particular tree could end early, if for a given generation the number of ancestors reaches by chance the number 2. Four examples of random trees generated are shown in Figure 2, where R_n in (11) corresponds to the case in which all ancestors are different in each n -generation.

Nevertheless with this first approach presented sometimes we obtained very endogamous trees. The reason for this was that any possible combination of inbreed-

ing between ancestors has the same probability (uniform distribution) and becomes very unlikely a non-inbreeding case, therefore we need to introduce additional considerations over the endogamy degree. Therefore we improve the algorithm in order to provide a more realistic simulation.

II.2. A more sophisticated tree of ancestors

We found a way to have more control of the endogamy degree of the tree. We enrich the algorithm by endowing it with the possibility of switch the reproduction between inbreeding or not. We used a second random number generator in each generation n , namely s_n , that returns an integer $s_n = 0$ nor $s_n = 1$. The outcome of s_n and r_n can affect to r_{n+1} stochastically. One of the leading actors in this algorithm is the distribution used for the random generator number r_{n+1} , taking to account the previous result for r_n and the branch from which it comes. Analytically this is equivalent to a conditional probability for r_{n+1} given r_n and s_n : $P(r_{n+1}|r_n, s_n)$. A schematic diagram of the above description is shown in Figure 3.

On the other hand, in this work we considered equal probabilities for each branch, i.e. $s_n = 0$ or $s_n = 1$: $P(s_n = 0) = P(s_n = 1)$. Then of course, we have 50% chances to obtain $s_n = 0$, also the same chances also for $s_n = 1$, for each n .

Different reproductive behavior such as one male mating with several females in a group, could be changed via the percent rate in this second generator, or for instance other behavior like sibling selection could be included via the probability distribution of animal preferences using another distribution of probability different of the uniform, to give different weights within the inbreeding selection option, between 2 and $2r_n - 1$.

We explore different distributions of random numbers for the development of each individual tree, but we selected those that could be linked experimentally with an animal reproductive behavior. In this case we study a uniform distribution and a negative exponential distribution for the growing of the tree and a negative exponential distribution for the decay of the tree. These and other more details will be exposed in the following section.

II.3. Details on the tree simulation parameters

Due to the freedom in the algorithm design as well as in its parameters, it is necessary to specify the information that lead to one possible development of the tree. Taking to account the experimental data, most of our assumptions could be replace by constraints of nature.

We want the reader to be able to use the algorithm, i.e. choose the parameters and the probability distribution, in a way that would be useful to represent real data sets. Here in this section we present our selection of parameters.

Each simulated tree has a maximum length of N generations, but of course a given execution may finish before, as we explain in section II.1. The simulation process is mainly separated into two regimens: *growth* and *decay*; where the ancestors number increases and decreases, on average, respectively. As we explained above in section II.1 we chose a generation to be the one where the number of ancestors is maximum. We do not chose the maximum number of ancestors, we only chose where this maximum is reached, denoted by N_μ . After this generation the number of ancestor could never exceed the random value obtained for N_μ -generation. This generation define the *growth interval*: $[0, N_\mu]$. In this paper we used $N_\mu = N/2$. The *decay interval* is defined from N_μ to N . Both parts of the tree development, *growth* and *decay*, are ruled almost by the same algorithm rule: using a second random number generator s_n to make a bifurcation in the algorithm. All these bifurcations leads to different actions depending on the regime we are dealing with, i.e. growth or decay.

For the *growth* regime, remember the interval $[0, N_\mu]$, if $s_n = 0$ the ancestor's number at generation $n+1$ will be the maximum possible with no inbreeding: $r_{n+1} = 2r_n$. This means that each ancestor in the generation n has all different parents in the generation $n+1$, i.e. the pairs of parents of each individual of generation $n+1$ are different one to one. If $s_n = 1$ we well have for r_{n+1} any kind of inbreeding reflected between 2 and $2r_n - 1$. For this branch we use a uniform or a negative exponential distribution for the random number r_{n+1} .

The *decay* regime is subdivided in two parts, the first one is defined up to a cut generation N_γ . In this interval, $[N_\mu, N_\gamma]$, the $s_n = 0$ and $s_n = 1$ branches are equally the same as in the growth regime, the only difference here is that we only use a negative exponential distribution for the random number r_{n+1} . The second one is a more *harder decay* version of the first part. In the interval $[N_\gamma, N]$ we replace the not endogamy rule, in the $s_n = 0$ branch, for a full-endogamy rule. We define full-endogamy as the case where the number of ancestors is fixed and constraint to the number of individuals at the beginning of the ancestors tree. In an extreme case, the minimal number of individuals prefixed wold be 2 or 4, but could be any number. This pre-fixed number represents the upper bound of the initial number of individuals at the beginning of the population who originated the tree. In other words, we merge random endogamy probability with the probability of having a low fix number of ancestors; that, again, represent the upper bound




FIG. 2. (Color online). Example of four kinds of genealogical trees from present time to past. Red dots are the ancestors number for each n -generation at most equal to $N = 50$. All examples are compared with no-endogamic tree, $R_n = 2^{n+1}$, represented with the black line.




FIG. 3. (Color online) Diagram of a generic link associated to the transition $r_n \mapsto r_{n+1}$. There is 2 branches from the intermediate state s_n , q_n is equal to the probability to stay in $s_n = 0$, upper branch (green), i.e. $q_n = P(s_n = 0)$, p_n is equal to the probability to stay in $s_n = 1$, lower branch (red), i.e. $q_n = P(s_n = 0)$ and $p_n = 1 - q_n$. The notation for the conditional probabilities is simplified $P_{n+1,n}^0 = P(r_{n+1}|r_n, s_n = 0)$ and $P_{n+1,n}^1 = P(r_{n+1}|r_n, s_n = 1)$.

of individuals at the beginning of an initial population. The $s_n = 1$ branch remains the same, only use a negative exponential distribution for the random number r_{n+1} .

For this reason, we call the first part as *soft decay* and the second part as *hard decay*.

The $s_n = 1$ branch is equally the same as in the first

In the Figures presented here, the N_γ is selected 10 generations before N . Even when some trees could end

by chance before this generation, we used this rule to conduce any surviving tree to converge to the maximum possible value of individual who originated the tree, at N -generation could be 2, 4 or any other value. The number of ancestors at the end of tree is constrained to the number of individuals who originated a particular population.

To summarize the development of ancestor's tree could be split in three steps delimited by this four generations ordered as follows: $0 < N_\mu < N_\gamma < N$. The *growth* region starting from generation 0 to N_μ and for the *decay* region consisting in two intervals: *soft decay* from N_μ to N_γ and *hard decay* from N_γ to N .

As we said before, we could add on the simulation a condition to request that not all possible inbreeding options be equally likely. To do that we used a different distribution in the growth representing differences in animal mate preferences. We compared a simulation using the uniform distribution, i.e. no preference in mate selection, with a simulation using the negative exponential distribution (siblings preference). In the case of the second option, there is an additional free parameter in the distribution that allow us to control the endogamy de-

gree.

The exponential decay case corresponds to a very inbred preference of the ancestors (close kin), where an increasing exponential distribution corresponds to avoid the incest as long as possible (within the random case). The opposite case is an increasing exponential distributions, it corresponds to a preference selection of a not close kin when selecting a kin for mate.

We chose a *shift* in the negative exponential distribution, that depends on the generation. This shift was chosen in order to obtain the maximum endogamous probability at the half of the interval between 2 and $2r_{n-1} - 1$ for each generation n . In the decay part, our selection was always using the exponential decay distribution, since we want to give in the decay more weight to the endogamous preference.

Other additional distribution could be used, such a gaussian distribution. In this case there is an additional parameter to fix, that not necessary represent an aspect in animal mate selection. We did not use such distribution because we want that all parameters represent some aspect on the animal mate preference. But even so, the gaussian distribution could be use in other similar simulations based on the ancestors simulation algorithm to represent some other markovian process.

In Section III we show a way to describe the simulation as a theoretical stochastic process, that allows to describe the expected value of r_{n+1} given the values of (r_n, s_n) , as a recurrence equation, using the *Law of total probability*. The expected value for r_{n+1} depends on two terms corresponding to the cases $s_n = 0$ nor $s_n = 1$.

II.4. Building an ensemble of trees

Once we generated the tree for one individual, we studied what happens with a general population with independent ancestors trees generated as explain in section II.3. The process consist in generate the reproductive history of each individual for a certain number of generations (to create a set of individual random trees) and then take the average of the total population, generation by generation. In that way we have a representative mean behavior of the trees population for each generation.

The average of the generated trees samples could be compared with the expected value of the random variable in the first theoretical model [17].

Our first trial was made considering a population of 50 individuals each one with its own tree, to have an animal population large enough but a fast simulation in order to study different effect on the selection of model parameters, i.e. we averaged each generation of the independent 50 trees.

There are other ways to combine the trees without us-

ing the mean of the sample set, for instance by means of a genetic algorithm [24]. But the arbitrary choice of a parameter over others to optimize the trees (fitness) and use them as seeds to generate new trees prevent us to follow this approach. Additional studies with data from the biology field are necessary to follow the genetic algorithm approach. Comments on the proposed model from biologists are specially welcome to enlighten us to follow this possible path.

II.5. Results of trees ensembles

In order to perform the simulation we used different distributions for the random number generator as described in Section II.3. The most simple case consist in taking the uniform distribution. The results obtained with uniform distribution are presented in Figure 4 (right). The uncertainties in all Figures are the bin errors associated with each y_b , the data of the y -axis in the b -bin. This quantity are calculate as the standard error on the mean as $\Delta y_b = S(y_b)/\sqrt{n_b}$, where $S(y_b)$ is the standard deviation (*RMS*) of the y_b data and n_b is the number of bin entries, in this case the number of trees that are considered in the calculation of the mean at the b -bin.

Different selection for the generation where the ancestors number start to decrease and a maximum generation to end the process, N , previously described in II.3 are shown in Figure 4. In each case, the mean ancestors number grows, reaches a maximum value and then decrease, depending on the maximum generation to end the process. Figures shows process ending up to generation $N = 20$, increasing this value up to $N = 30$. When we change the maximum generation, the evolution of the mean value is affected as it is shown in Figure 4.

Other possible setting for the tree of ancestors is not to finish the process when the number of ancestors is two and end it with a different number of ancestors as initial population as we said in Section II.3. This case corresponds to a particular population starting not with 2 original ancestors, but with other number of couples of animals. For instance 200 original individuals as the initial population. This case is shown in Figure 5. This is a parameter that can be change in order to compare with a known animal population under study.

We used a negative exponential distribution, with the same constraints representing a preference for the animals to chose close kins and compare it with the uniform case. We expected to obtain smaller values for the ancestors number in this case.

A comparison between the case using the uniform distribution and the exponential decade distribution are




FIG. 4. Mean ancestors number for each generation. Average of 50 trees. For each tree the random generator uses an uniform distribution of random numbers. From left to right and from top to bottom the maximum generation in each case is $N = 20$, $N = 22$, $N = 24$, $N = 26$, $N = 28$ and $N = 30$.

shown in Figure 5, where the average of 50 trees generated with each one are shown with dots and squares. As we expected smaller values for the ancestors number are obtain when using the exponential distribution for the same values of initial population and maximum generation.

The Figure 5 (TOP) corresponds to the case where the

initial ancestors number is different to 2, using the uniform distribution. The Figure 5 (BOTTOM) corresponds to the comparison between the uniform distribution and the negative exponential distribution.

In terms of the simulation, the code execution collects a certain number of realizations, i.e. a number of generated trees N_T . In n -generation we compute the number of




FIG. 5. (Color online) TOP: Mean ancestors number for each generation. Average of 50 trees starting with an initial population of 100 pairs of animals, with uniform distribution. BOTTOM: A comparison for the 50 ancestors tree generated with uniform distribution (higher) and negative exponential distribution (lower).

trees, coming from executions of the code, that have not finished in that generation, whose result for r_n is *equal to* r , denoted by $T(n|r)$, divided by the total number of trees, coming from executions that have not finished in that generation also, denoted by $T(n)$. This quotient could work as a pdf of r_n

$$\mathbb{P}[r_n = r] \sim \frac{T(n|r)}{T(n)}, \quad (3)$$

the symbol $\sim$ represent a correspondence satisfied more properly conform N_T grows, i.e. a large number of code executions. Each generated tree is a certain histogram, distributed in mutually exclusive cases, $r = 2, 3 \dots$, then the quotient on the right side of (3) will be normalized properly

$$\sum_r \frac{T(n|r)}{T(n)} = 1. \quad (4)$$

If we have from the simulation a quantity *almost* equal

to the prior distribution, we can obtain the expected value, or even more, the higher k -order moments for each generation n , denoted by $\langle r_n^k \rangle$, associated to the distribution using the definition provided by the theory of probability

$$\langle r_n^k \rangle \sim \sum_r r^k \frac{T(n|r)}{T(n)}. \quad (5)$$

With this simple simulation we built individual trees and ensembles of trees for animals, in order to use them to show characteristics of the process. In the simulation we represented the animal preference for mate by a set of free parameter of the proposed algorithmic model. The examples presented are not intended to be exhaustive, just to give an idea on the consequence of parameter selection. This preference could be taken from experimental data, with a different number of individuals of the population under study or different group of original ancestors. Further models could include other characteristics of particular animal groups, even a different way to generate the ensemble of trees.

II.6. About the model computation of sets of trees

Another variable to consider is the time that takes to create a full tree. It depends on the length of the tree, longer trees need more computational time. Simulations up to 100 generations when we generate 2×10^5 trees takes much more than 4 hours. The current code implementation is linear with the generation number. It could be improved in the future using parallel programming tools [23].

The model of the tree described here was implemented in C++ using ROOT libraries [22]. This object oriented framework also was used to analyze the results of the simulation. All tools used in present work correspond to open source packages.

III. REBUILDING THE COMPUTATIONAL MODEL ANALYTICALLY

In this section we describe the simulation analytically, such as a theoretical stochastic process. We will give the tools to the reader in order to describe the algorithm analytically. With them we can describe not only these types of trees, but also we can generalize the process, in order to study this and other problems analytically.

For the kind of trees described in Section II.2, we consider the stochastic process of two random variables (r_n, s_n) on *discrete time* n . As we said, the random variable r_n represents the ancestor number at generation n and the role of the random variable s_n will be to define

paths for the values that can take r_{n+1} , given the acquired value at previous generation, r_n . In Section II.1 we have seen that for $s_n = 1$ case the sample space of r_n , $\mathbf{R}_n$, is delimited by the obtained value for r_{n-1} , i.e. $\mathbf{R}_n = \{[2, 2r_{n-1}]\}$. As a general rule, we *throw* a random number, s_n , at generation n between two possibilities, for instance $\{0, 1\}$. According to the result of s_n , we choose one of the following two branches, where $\mathbf{R}_{n+1}^{s_n}$ is the set of values for r_{n+1} given $s_n = 0, 1$ and r_n also. The transition behavior of the process is governed, essentially, though the conditional probability $P(r_{n+1}|s_n, r_n)$ as we see in Figure 3. In this paper we use different distribution according to the current subprocess.

In Section II.2 we introduce the *growth* and *decay* regimes, in this section we describe it analytically as a subprocesses of the main stochastic process. First of all we distinguish this two subprocesses

▲ *Growth subprocess* $n \in [0, N_\mu]$

If $s_n = 0$, we take $r_{n+1} = 2r_n$, i.e. we assign the double of the ancestor number obtained in generation n , as the new number of ancestors for generation $n + 1$. If $s_n = 1$, we take r_{n+1} as a random variable, with a *certain probability distribution* whose support is $[2, 2r_n - 1]$. We use two kind of distribution for $P(r_{n+1}|r_n, s_n = 1)$ *uniform* and *negative exponential*.

▼ *Decay subprocess* $n \in [N_\mu, N]$

The algorithm is similar, but is subdivided according to the generation number n :

1. *Soft Decay* $n \in [N_\mu, N_\gamma]$. For the branch $s_n = 0$, we continue to use a *delta* distribution that assign for r_{n+1} the double of the previous generation: $r_{n+1} = 2r_n$. For the branch $s_n = 1$, we use only *negative exponential* distribution for $P(r_{n+1}|r_n, s_n = 1) \sim e^{-\lambda_n r_{n+1}}$ over the set $\mathbf{R}_{n+1}^1$. The characteristic parameter of this distribution is λ_n , is chosen in order to give more predominance to the smaller values of $\mathbf{R}_{n+1}^1$. Moreover we add a constraint, the value of r_{n+1} is bounded through the value obtained in N_μ, r_μ , this is $r_{n+1} \leq r_\mu$.

2. *Hard Decay* $n \in [N_\gamma, N]$. But enforce the decay, we changing slightly the branch $s_n = 0$. Now we choose a random value (uniformly distributed) between 2 and α_N , this number α_N is pre-fixed and represents the upper bound of the initial number of individuals at the beginning of the population that have made the complete tree. The branch $s_n = 1$ is governed by the same rule as in the *soft decay* regime. Also we still using $r_{n+1} \leq r_\mu$.

We use only *negative exponential* distribution for $P(r_{n+1}|r_n, s_n)$. Also the value r_{n+1} is bounded through

the value obtained in N_μ, r_μ , this is $r_{n+1} \leq r_\mu$.

A general diagram in Figure 6 summarizes the sophistication implemented in the algorithm.




FIG. 6. Diagram associated to the simulation process. The value of the random variable r_{n+1} depends of the value obtained in the previous generation for r_n and s_n . The remark in the r_i node, also in s_i , corresponds to the initial condition equal to 2^{i+1} at the initial generation $i = 0, 1$.

For the growth and soft decay subprocesses the random variable s_n generate a partition of the sample space of r_{n+1} . We see that explicitly from $\mathbf{R}_{n+1}^0 = \{2r_n\}$ and $\mathbf{R}_{n+1}^1 = \{[0, 2r_n - 1]\}$, then $\mathbf{R}_{n+1} = \mathbf{R}_{n+1}^0 \cup \mathbf{R}_{n+1}^1$, and $\mathbf{R}_{n+1}^0 \cap \mathbf{R}_{n+1}^1 = \Phi$, the empty set.

However, in any regime we will have that

$$P(r_{n+1}) = \sum_{s_n=0,1} P(r_{n+1}, s_n) \quad (6)$$

because the random variable s_n defines a particular branch, which involves an *exclusive* action over r_{n+1} .

In the simulation proposed we choose the same probability distribution for all Bernoulli random variables $\{s_n\}$: $P(s_n = 0) = \frac{1}{2}$, for all generations $n \geq i$. This corresponds to the situation of maximum ignorance (disorder) about the process. We can generalize this situation denoting $p_n := P(s_n = 1)$ and the complementary probability $q_n := P(s_n = 0) = 1 - p_n$. Using the definition of conditional probability $P(r_{n+1}, s_n) = P(r_{n+1}|s_n)P(s_n)$ and from (6) we express $P(r_{n+1})$ as a convex combination

$$P(r_{n+1}) = q_n P(r_{n+1}|s_n = 0) + p_n P(r_{n+1}|s_n = 1) \quad (7)$$

By definition the expected value is

$$E(r_{n+1}) := \int_{\mathbf{R}_{n+1}} r_{n+1} P(r_{n+1}), \quad (8)$$

the *special sum* notation defines as follows

$$\int_{x \in \mathbf{X}} * := \begin{cases} \sum_{x \in \mathbf{X}} * : & \text{if } \mathbf{X} \text{ numerable,} \\ \int_{x \in \mathbf{X}} * dx : & \text{if } \mathbf{X} \text{ not numerable.} \end{cases}$$

The expression (7) allows to get an expression for the expected value $E(r_{n+1})$ from (8)

$$E(r_{n+1}) = q_n E(r_{n+1}|s_n = 0) + p_n E(r_{n+1}|s_n = 1) \quad (9)$$

this expression reveals the contributions from each branch to the expected value.

The simulation can be mathematically reformulated as follows: the random number obtained in generation $n+1$, r_{n+1} , is affected by the result of two random values in generation n : (r_n, s_n) . We say that in each generation the random variable r_n run over a certain support $\mathbf{R}_n$. In generation $n+1$ the events $\{(r_n, s_n) : r_n \in \mathbf{R}_n, s_n \in \{0, 1\}\}$ conforms a partition of the sample space $\mathbf{R}_{n+1}$.

The role of the random variable r_n is implicit in (6) and (9), it appears in the sample space $\mathbf{R}_{n+1}$ explicitly and in the parameters of $P(r_{n+1}|s_n)$ eventually. Furthermore the diagram in Figure 3, that represents a link in the process, it does not show the *prior* probability $P(r_n)$ explicitly. Nevertheless, in order to provide a more specific description of transition $r_n \mapsto r_{n+1}$ we need to write the probability $P(r_{n+1})$ in terms of $P(r_n)$ also. Note that the notation is simplified, $P(r_n)$ means the pdf associated to the random variable r_n .




FIG. 7. (Color online) On the left we show the specific values that r_n can take, from 2 to the maximum, denoted by q_n , this value is related to the last link. Each value of r_n have two possibilities (branches) to jump on the intermediate state s_n , i.e. $s_n = 0$ dashed line (green) and $s_n = 1$ continuous line (red).

We use the *Law of total probability* for the general two random variables (x, y)

$$P(y) = \int_x P(y|x) P(x), \quad (10)$$

where $P(x)$ is a simplification of the notation of the probability to find the random variable x equal to a certain number, for the discrete case, or in the infinitesimal interval near that includes the value x , for the case of continuous case.

As we show in Figure 7, given this two values (r_n, s_n) there is a certain probability to jump on a particular value r_{n+1} , i.e. if we take $x \equiv (r_n, s_n)$ and $y \equiv r_{n+1}$ the

total contribution to $P(r_{n+1})$ its ruled by (10)

$$P(r_{n+1}) = \sum_{s_n=0,1} \int_{r_n \in \mathbf{R}_n} P(r_{n+1}|r_n, s_n) P(r_n, s_n). \quad (11)$$

In each generation the random variables r_n and s_n are independent, then $P(r_n, s_n) = P(r_n)P(s_n)$, then from (11) we have

$$P(r_{n+1}) = \int_{r_n \in \mathbf{R}_n} T(r_{n+1}|r_n) P(r_n), \quad (12)$$

where

$$T(r_{n+1}|r_n) := \sum_{s_n=0,1} P(r_{n+1}, s_n|r_n) \mathbf{1}_{s_n}(r_n), \quad (13)$$

and also $\mathbf{1}_{s_n}(r_n)$ is an indicator function, $\mathbf{1}_{s_n}(r_n) = 1$, if $r_n \in \mathbf{R}_n^{s_n}$ and $\mathbf{1}_{s_n}(r_n) = 0$ otherwise. The expression (12) shows the markovian property of this stochastic process. The transition elements $T(r_{n+1}|r_n)$ and initial condition governs the time evolution of the prior probability distribution $P(r_n)$. In Figure (6) the initial arrows connecting the nodes s_i and r_i with r_{i+1} represent the possibility to *throw* a random number s_i , in i -generation, in order to choose the sample space for the next random number r_{i+1} , given the number r_i . The same sentence is also valid for the arrows connecting the nodes s_n and r_n with r_{n+1} . By definition of sexual reproduction specie we have $r_0 = 2$. In this work also we assigned $r_1 = 2r_0$ directly, without any second random number s_0 in generation $n = 0$. In other words the initial condition for the simulation is given in $i = 1$: $r_1 = 4$, the *grandparents* generation.

Nevertheless we describe the general algorithm with *initial condition* at i -generation, $i = 0, 1$, denoting by $r_i = 2^{i+1}$, trivially the expected value at this generation is $E(r_i) = 2^{i+1}$.

We can obtain a recurrence equation for *growth* and *soft decay* regimes, presented in Section II.3. In that cases the algorithm establishes that

$$P(r_{n+1}|r_n, s_n = 0) = \delta_{r_{n+1}, 2r_n} \quad (14)$$

in the discrete case ($P(r_{n+1}|r_n, s_n = 0) = \delta(r_{n+1} - 2r_n)$, in the continuous case). Using this conditions on all the terms that $s_n = 0$ of expression (11), to reduce the expression (9) and leads

$$E(r_{n+1}) = 2q_n E(r_n) + \xi_{n+1}, \quad (15)$$

this is a *non-homogeneous linear recurrence equation*, valid from $n \geq i$, where ξ_{n+1} is the in-homogeneity term given by

$$\xi_{n+1} := \int_{\mathbf{R}_{n+1}} \int_{\mathbf{R}_n} r_{n+1} P(r_{n+1}|r_n, s_n = 1) P(r_n) p_n, \quad (16)$$

This equation contains the trivial case: $p_n = 0$ (i.e. $q_n = 1$) for all $n \geq i$, corresponding to *no inbreeding* in all generations. In this situation the *non-endogamic* solution of (15) is

$$E(r_n) = 2^{n+1}. \quad (17)$$

We can express the general solution of (15), by iteration until i -generation, as follows

$$E(r_n) = 2^{n-i} q_{n-1} \cdots q_i E(r_i) + \sum_{k=i+1}^n 2^{n-k} \frac{q_i \cdots q_{n-1}}{q_i \cdots q_{k-1}} \xi_k, \quad (18)$$

where $n \geq i+1$. Again if we take $q_k = 1$ (e.g. $\xi_k = 0$), for all k , in (18) we recover the *non-endogamic* (or trivial) solution (17).

The *first term* of (18) correspond to the case in which we have no inbreeding in all previous generations to n (until i -generation), because the product $q_i \cdots q_{n-1}$ is just equal to this intersection probability

$$P(s_i = 0, \dots, s_{n-1} = 0) = P(s_i = 0) \cdots P(s_{n-1} = 0).$$

In the *second terms* of (18) we have the quotients of $q_k^i s$ that are just equal to this intersection probability

$$\frac{q_i \cdots q_{n-1}}{q_i \cdots q_{k-1}} = P(s_k = 0, \dots, s_{n-1} = 0),$$

for $k = 1, \dots, n-1$ and is equal to 1, for $k = n$.

The paper simulation is based on the case that $q_n = \frac{1}{2}$, for all $n \geq i$.

$$E(r_n) = E(r_i) + \sum_{k=i+1}^n \xi_k. \quad (19)$$

We recall that the inhomogeneous terms ξ_k can be written as

$$\xi_k = E(r_k, s_{k-1} = 1) \quad (20)$$

Continuing with the last regime, for the *hard decay* defined on Section II.3, the algorithm establishes that r_{n+1} is a uniformly distributed in $[2, \alpha_N]$, we have simply

$$E(r_{n+1}) = q_n \frac{\alpha_N + 2}{2} + \xi_{n+1}. \quad (21)$$

We can give more satisfactory description in terms of high order moments of $P(r_n)$. We obtain an expression for *growth* and *soft decay* regimes, from the moment generating function associated to $P(r_n)$ we prove that

$$E(r_{n+1}^k) = 2^k q_n E(r_n^k) + \zeta_{n+1}^k \quad (22)$$

where $\zeta_{n+1}^k := E(r_{n+1}^k, s_n = 1)$. The recurrent equations (22) and (15) has the same structure and the same kind of solution.

For the *hard decay* regime we prove that

$$E(r_{n+1}^k) = \frac{q_n}{k+1} \sum_{l=0}^k 2^{k-l} \alpha_N^l + \zeta_{n+1}^k \quad (23)$$

where $\zeta_{n+1}^k := E(r_{n+1}^k, s_n = 1)$. The recurrent equations (22) and (15) has the same structure and the same kind of solution.

We translate the center of the moment of k -order, supposing that we know all the previous moments $\{E(x^l) : l = 0, 1, \dots, k\}$, using $(x-c)^k = \sum_{l=0}^k \binom{k}{l} (-1)^{k-l} c^{k-l} x^l$, we have

$$E[(x-c)^k] = \sum_{l=0}^k \binom{k}{l} (-1)^{k-l} c^{k-l} E(x^l), \quad (24)$$

This expression can be useful to express $E[(x-E(x))^k]$ as a linear combination of power of $E(x)^n$ and $E(x^n)$ where $n = 0, 1, \dots, k$, in order to obtain the k -order moment centered around the mean value $E(x)$.

This theoretical approach allows to continue with the refinement of free parameters that the algorithm has, observing the analytical behavior of the solution, and more generally, the structure of the evolution equation. Regarding this, we want to add that there are also other ways to conduce the convergence of the tree. Other alternative is use only a negative exponential distribution ($\sim \lambda_n e^{-\lambda_n r_n}$) for all the *decay interval* $[N_\mu, N]$ and use its parameter λ_n to control the endogamy degree. This alternative exempts us from considering a cut generation, N_γ , a priori; there is no need to subdivide the *decay interval* into *soft* and *hard*.

In the following section we perform a comparison between the results of the proposed algorithm and the results of the theoretical paper [17].

IV. A COMPARISON WITH THE THEORETICAL TOY MODEL

We used the mean value of ancestor's number presented in [17] to compare it against data obtained with the computational model. The expression for the mean value of ancestors number at generation n , namely $\alpha(n)$, obtain in [17] was:

$$\alpha(n) = 2^{n+1} - \beta(n), \quad (25)$$

where $\beta(n)$ represent the mean value of individuals who are outside to the set of ancestors, with respect to the maximum possible number of ancestors in each generation n , in this case is equal to 2^{n+1} . Also

$$\beta(n) = 2^{an+b} \langle X(n) \rangle \quad (26)$$

is the product of expected value associated to the *diluted process*, $\langle X(n) \rangle$, modulated by 2^{an+b} , [17]. Explicitly $\langle X(n) \rangle$ is equal to

$$\langle X(n) \rangle = e^{-2n} [2n I_1(2n) + (2n + \frac{1}{2}) I_0(2n)] - \frac{1}{2}, \quad (27)$$

where $I_n(x)$ are the modified Bessel function [25].

The ancestors number, $\alpha(n)$, depends on two parameters $\mathbf{a}$ and $\mathbf{b}$. If the expected value satisfies $\alpha(t_1) = \alpha_1$ and $\alpha(t_2) = \alpha_2$, for two generations t_1 and t_2 such that $t_1 \neq 0 \neq t_2$, the parameters $\mathbf{a}$ and $\mathbf{b}$ can be obtained by

$$\mathbf{a} = \frac{1}{t_2 - t_1} \log_2 \left[\frac{2^{t_2+1} - \alpha_2}{2^{t_1+1} - \alpha_1} \frac{\langle X(t_1) \rangle}{\langle X(t_2) \rangle} \right] \quad (28)$$

$$\mathbf{b} = \frac{1}{t_2 - t_1} \left\{ t_2 \log_2 \left[\frac{2^{t_1+1} - \alpha_1}{\langle X(t_1) \rangle} \right] - t_1 \log_2 \left[\frac{2^{t_2+1} - \alpha_2}{\langle X(t_2) \rangle} \right] \right\}$$

where $\alpha_i \leq 2^{t_i+1}$, for $i = 1, 2$, to ensure good definition of $\mathbf{a}$ and $\mathbf{b}$. These parameters can be related with the maximum ancestors number in a given generation and the horizontal range [17].

We used the equation for the mean number of ancestors depending on these parameters and performed a fit of the expression to our simulation data, in Figure 8.

Also it is possible to obtain $\mathbf{a}$ and $\mathbf{b}$ parameters for any case that we want to study. The values for the fit parameter will make sense when experimental data would be use.

The Table I summarizes the values for $\mathbf{a}$ and $\mathbf{b}$ obtain for different distributions and the same final generations to end the process.

Uniform distribution		
$\mathbf{a}$	0.997	± 0.001
$\mathbf{b}$	-0.73	± 0.01
Negative Exponential distribution		
$\mathbf{a}$	0.956	± 0.004
$\mathbf{b}$	-0.25	± 0.4

TABLE I. Values of the fit parameters for two different cases corresponding to Figure 5 for trees of maximum generation $N = 20$.

The mean value of ancestors in the set behaves with the generation in a similar way to the mean value obtained the theoretical model. This simulation could include more specific information of particular species or field studies with animals. Also it could be possible to combine the simulation with genetic algorithms to obtain a powerful tool to trace the combination of genes trough the history of a particular specie.




FIG. 8. (Color online). Mean ancestors number for each generation. Average of 50 trees with the corresponding fit. The fit is valid up to 12 generations and the process ends a few generations late. TOP: uniform distribution. BOTTOM: negative exponential distribution

Even when we can obtain close results fitting the theoretical model parameters, our simulation is an improvement on the first theoretical model, in the sense that it is possible to modify and chose a certain distribution to model animal preferences in mate selection. Also the case studied in [17], that is theoretical model in particular conditions, could not reproduce a slow decreasing of ancestors number as it is expected in a soft transition in consecutive generations. As we said in [17] the result of this model can be improved with a different choice of the gauge function $\lambda(t)$. In this algorithmic model, we can simulate an specific behavior in animal mate preference, according to the branch prior probabilities q_n and the transition probabilities $P(r_{n+1}|r_n, s_n)$. This algorithm propose a more robust model that the first proposed in [17].

V. CONCLUSIONS AND FURTHER WORK

We presented a toy model based on a recursive algorithm. This model allow us to include animal mate preferences and build a more realistic tree of ancestors. This simply dynamic model allows to introduce biological considerations to improve it and create a powerful tool in order to contribute in ecology and biology studies. We used the available tools learned from the field of physics. Finally present model could be use for biologist to compare and make predictions with real animal data.

The algorithm applied on this simulation can be used to describe other biological or physical systems with similar dynamics. Statistical models of biparental reproduction have already been compared with physical systems, such as spin-glass systems [26]. Also in this regard the evolutionary graph theory is an approach to study how topology affects the evolution of a population [27].

Some open questions related to the nature of the process have raised from the developed simulation, for instance: How many generations makes sense to follow the

tree of ancestors? How to chose where to end the tree? What happed with the human case? Differences between population of the same species wold be evident in the data when compare to the model?

Further work include a developing of an algorithm version in python code, with parallel programing improvements.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by CONICET and UNQ Institutions. We thank the scientist from the biology field who encourage us to keep working in biological models. We thank also our reviewers Graciela Molina and Pablo Alcain for their contribution to this work. And finally, a very special mention to Micaela Moretton, Maria Clara Caruso, and Gabriel Lio for always give us the local support. During the development of this work we have a new ancestor to include in the Caruso Family Tree and we want to dedicate the work to the new member.

-
- [1] Ohno, S. *The Malthusian parameter of ascents: What prevents the exponential increase of one's ancestors?* Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. 93, 1527615278 (1993)
 - [2] Charlesworth, D., and Charlesworth, B. (1987). *Inbreeding depression and its evolutionary consequences*. Annu. Rev. Ecol. Sys. 18, 237268.
 - [3] Peer, K., and Taborsky, M. (2005). *Outbreeding depression, but no inbreeding depression in haplodiploid ambrosia beetles with regular sibling mating*. Evolution Int. J. Org. Evolution 59, 317323.
 - [4] Templeton, A.R. (1986). *Coadaptation and outbreeding depression*. In *Conservation Biology: The Science of Scarcity and Diversity*, M.E. Soule, ed. (Sunderland, MA: Sinauer Associates), pp. 105116
 - [5] Pusey, A., and Wolf, M. (1996). *Inbreeding avoidance in animals*. Trends Ecol. Evol. 11, 201206.
 - [6] Gerlach, G., and Lysiak, N. (2006). *Kin recognition and inbreeding avoidance in zebrafish* Anim. Behav. 71, 13711377.
 - [7] Frommen, J.G., and Bakker, T.C.M. (2006). *Inbreeding avoidance through non-random mating in sticklebacks*. Biol. Lett. 2,232235.
 - [8] Bateson, P. (1983). *Optimal outbreeding*. In *Mate Choice*, P. Bateson, ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp.257277.
 - [9] Bateson, P. (1982). *Preferences for cousins in Japanese quail*, Nature 295, 236237.
 - [10] Neff, B.D. (2004). *Stabilizing selection on genomic divergence in a wild fish population*, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 101, 2381-2385.
 - [11] Willi, Y., and Van Buskirk, J. (2005). *Genomic compatibility occurs over a wide range of parental genetic similarity in an outcrossing plant*. Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B. Biol. Sci. 272, 13331338.
 - [12] Jamieson, I.G. et al. (2009) *Why some species of birds do not avoid inbreeding: insights from New Zealand robins and saddlebacks*. Behav. Ecol. 20, 575584.
 - [13] Rioux-Paquette, E. et al. (2010). *No inbreeding avoidance in an isolated population of bighorn sheep*. Anim. Behav. 80, 865871.
 - [14] Szulkin, M. et al. (2009) *Inbreeding avoidance under different null models of random mating in the great tit*. J. Anim. Ecol. 78, 778788.
 - [15] Thunken, T. et al. (2007) *Active inbreeding in a cichlid fish and its adaptive significance*. Curr. Biol. 17, 225229.
 - [16] Nichols HJ, Cant MA, Hoffman JI, Sanderson JL. 2014. *Evidence for frequent incest in a cooperatively breeding mammal*. Biol. Lett. 10: 20140898. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2014.0898>.
 - [17] M.Caruso, C. Jarne. Physical Review E 90, 022125 (2014).
 - [18] J. H. Bennett, Ann. Eugen. 17, 311 (1952).
 - [19] J. H. Bennett, J. Theor. Biol. 4, 28 (1963).
 - [20] G. H. Hardy, Sci. N. S. 28, 49 (1908).
 - [21] W. Weinberg, U ber den Nachweis der Vererbung beim Menschen. Jahresh. Ver. Vaterl Naturkd. Wurttemb. 64, 369 (1908) (English translations in Boyer 1963 and Jamenson 1977).
 - [22] Rene Brun and Fons Rademakers, *ROOT - An Object Oriented Data Analysis Framework*, Proceedings AI-HENP'96 Workshop, Lausanne, Sep. 1996, Nucl. Inst. & Meth. in Phys. Res. A 389 (1997) 81-86. See also <http://root.cern.ch/>.

- [23] C. Jarne. *Markov process simulation for ancestors trees (the code parallelization)*. Talk from the Introductory School on Parallel Programming and Parallel Architecture for High-Performance Computing. Trieste; 2016. <http://indico.ictp.it/event/7659/session/19/contribution/95>.
- [24] A. S. Fraser. *Monte Carlo Analyses of Genetic Models*. Nature 181, 208-209 (18 January 1958) doi : 10.1038/181208a0
- [25] Abramowitz, M. Stegun, I. A., *Handbook of mathematical functions* (Dover books on mathematics 1972).
- [26] M. Serva and L. Peliti, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 24, L705 (1991).
- [27] E. Liberman, C. Hauert, and M. A. Nowak, Nature 433, 312(2005).